

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****OCT 23 2006****REMARKS**

The claims have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the present invention. Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the forward projecting means is a first reflecting mirror. The subsequent use of "reflecting mirror" has been designated "second reflecting mirror" so as to clearly distinguish between the two mirrors. Changes have been made to other claims for consistency of terminology. Claims 1-4, 7 and 8 remain for consideration.

Claims 1-4, 7, and 8 were previously rejected as being unpatentable over Petterson in view of Natsume and Maglica. Applicant submits that claims 1-4, 7, and 8 patentably distinguish over the combination of Petterson, Natsume, and Maglica. As previously discussed, Petterson does not anticipate the present invention. Petterson comprises an illumination apparatus having a light source and a parabolic reflector and a Fresnel lens (see column 3, lines 50-54. The light source (18) can be movably positioned along the principal axis of the parabolic reflector (see column 4, lines 48-53). In Petterson, the only variation of the position of the light source is relative to the reflecting mirror (parabolic reflector). Thus, the illumination apparatus does not include a distance varying means that can vary a distance between a first reflecting mirror (Fresnel lens 14) and the light source while the light source is positioned fixedly relative to the second reflecting mirror. Therefore, Petterson does not disclose the illumination apparatus including a distance varying means that can vary a distance between the first reflecting mirror and the light source while the light source is positioned fixedly relative to the second reflecting mirror. The Examiner recognizes shortcomings in Petterson and in paragraph 9 of the Office Action identifies three shortcomings. Natsume is then relied upon to make up two of the

shortcomings-the light source-fixing member and the transparent protective cover. The Examiner recognizes that the combination of Petterson and Natsume does not teach the "distance varying means" and so looks to Maglica to fill the gap. The Examiner appears to have laid out a hindsight rejection, which is improper. Hindsight is not a proper basis for rejecting claims. The claims remaining in this application are patentable over the combination of Petterson, Natsume, and Maglica and should be allowed.

Considering Natsume further, it is noted that Natsume does not suggest "a first reflecting mirror", as claimed. The corresponding element in Natsume is translucent panel 18 (Fig.18). Fig. 16 of Natsume does not disclose a member connected to a protective cover that corresponds to the claimed "first reflecting mirror". There is no basis for the combination of Petterson and Natsume suggested by the Examiner, given the different teachings of Petterson and Natsume.

Turning to Maglica, it is observed that Maglica fails to disclose an element that corresponds to "a first reflecting mirror", which in the present invention is the small diameter reflecting mirror 2 in Fig. 9.

From the foregoing it is clear that the claimed combination is not taught by the combination of Petterson, Natsume, and Maglica proposed by the Examiner. As discussed above, Petterson does not teach the "first reflecting mirror" and this deficiency is not made up by either of the secondary references. Claims 1-4, 7, and 8 are patentable over the combination of Petterson, Natsume, and Maglica and should be allowed.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 23, 2005

By: Seymour Rothstein
Seymour Rothstein (Reg. No. 19,369)

OLSON & HIERL, LTD.
20 North Wacker Drive
36th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 580-1180

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper and its attachments are being faxed to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at 571-273-8300 on October 23, 2005.

Seymour Rothstein
Seymour Rothstein (Reg. No. 19,369)